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# 1NC

The aff must prove that affirming the principle stated by the resolution is better justified than negating it. But there are different kinds of justification. Most reasons for accepting a principle have to do with epistemic evidence for the principle’s truth, but we can also have pragmatic reasons for belief. Jordan:

Jeff Jordan, [Professor of Philosophy at the University of Delaware],  "Pragmatic Arguments and Belief in God", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2011 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011/entries/pragmatic-belief-god/>. JMN

As with so much in philosophy, the first recorded employment of a pragmatic argument is found in Plato. At *Meno* 86b-c, Socrates tells Meno that believing in the value of inquiry is justified because of the positive impact upon one's character: Meno: Somehow or other I believe you are right. Socrates: I think I am. I shouldn't like to take my oath on the whole story, but one thing I am ready to fight for as long as I can, in word and act—that is, that we shall be better, braver, and more active men if we believe it right to look for what we don't know than if we believe there is no point in looking because what we don't know we can never discover. Meno: There too I am sure you are.[[1](http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/pragmatic-belief-god/notes.html" \l "1)] Paraphrased, Socrates' point is if being better, braver, and more active are among our desires, and if believing that inquiry is permissible facilitates our becoming better, braver, and more active, then we have reason, pragmatic reason, to believe that inquiry is permissible. Socrates' argument is an argument for the permissibility of a certain belief, based on the benefits of believing that certain belief. Pragmatic arguments are practical in orientation, justifying actions that are thought to facilitate the achievement of our goals, or the satisfaction of our desires. If among your goals is A, and if doing such and such results in your achieving A, then, all else being equal, you have reason to do such and such: Doing α brings about, or contributes in bringing about, β, and It is in your interest that β obtain. So, you have reason to do α. As presented this is a particular kind of pragmatic argument, a prudential argument. Prudential pragmatic arguments are predicated upon one's preferences or goals or self-interest. As we will see, there are pragmatic arguments that are not narrowly prudential but are moral in nature. Pragmatic arguments are relevant to belief-formation, since inculcating a belief is an action. There are, broadly speaking, two kinds of pragmatic arguments that have to do with belief-formation. The first is an argument that recommends taking steps to believe a proposition because, if it should turn out to be true, the benefits gained from believing that proposition will be impressive. This first kind of pragmatic argument we can call a “truth-dependent” pragmatic argument, or more conveniently a “dependent-argument,” since the benefits are obtained only if the relevant state of affairs occurs. The prime example of a dependent-argument is a pragmatic argument that uses a calculation of expected utility and employs the Expectation Rule to recommend belief: whenever both probability and utility values are known, one should choose to do an act which has the greatest expected utility. Among the various versions of his wager argument, Pascal employs this Rule in a version which states that no matter how small the probability that God exists, as long as it is a positive, non-zero probability, the expected utility of theistic belief will dominate the expected utility of disbelief. Given the distinction between (A) having reason to think a certain proposition is true, and (B) having reason to induce belief in that proposition, taking steps to generate belief in a certain proposition may be the rational thing to do, even if that proposition lacks sufficient evidential support. The benefits of believing a proposition can rationally take precedence over the evidential strength enjoyed by a contrary proposition; and so, given an infinite expected utility, Pascal's Wager contends that forming the belief that God exists is the rational thing to do, no matter how small the likelihood that God exists.

Those pragmatic reasons can be about the consequences of our beliefs but also about the language used to state them. Representations of our language affect our ability to act effectively and interact with others. Haste writes:

Helen Haste, [PhD of Psychology at the University of Bath], “Communitarianism and the Social Construction of Morality”, 1998. NC

Communitarian thinkersstart from a very different psychological tradition. They emphasise the **primacy of language and social interaction in the generation of meaning [is important]**. Taylor argues that **human life is ‘fundamentally dialogic …. We become full human agents, capable of understanding ourselves, and hence defining an identity, through our acquisition of rich human languages of expression.**’ (1991 p 32). This aligns the communitarian ontological position with social constructionists like John Shotter (1993) and Rom HarrZ (HarrZ and Gillett, 1994) who argue that the primary human reality is face-to-face conversation. **If social interaction is the crucible of meaning, then the child learns about morality through discourse and through social practices**, both explicit and implicit. **The ‘meaning’ of something – including the meaning of our own identity and our morality – depends on what is comprehensible and recognized within our social community. Social beings create their identity through shared discourse and language** (Shotter, 1993). Communities are multiple; we are members of many communities which each offer us identity, and personal meaning, and within each different elements and skills are salient. Cultural narratives, stories and traditions feed directly into our identity, signaling valued attributes and behaviours, and giving an explanation for our past and present. Crucially, we also recognize that these are shared by those whom we thus define as members of our community. A moral obligation can only have meaning within a social context. Richard Shweder describes taboos and practices found amongst rural Hindus in India which are quite morally meaningless to Americans, because they are associated with beliefs about pollution which are not shared (Shweder et al, 1987). However practices may be widely condemned, but for different reasons – believing that rape is wrong because it defiles the victim’s purity, is very different from seeing it as wrong because treats her as an object rather than a person.

We have pragmatic reasons to reject the principle of the resolution’s use of the phrase “repeated domestic violence”.

The counter-advocacy is to reject the victim’s use of deadly force in situations of repeated domestic violence and embrace the victim’s use of deadly force in situations of ongoing coercive control.

First, the domestic violence model assumes that women cannot leave because of physical assault, but conceals the oppressive aspect of abuse, translating into disastrous consequences for victims. Stark:

Evan Stark, [Professor of Human Services and Chair, Department of Urban Health Administration at Rutgers University], *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*, Oxford University Press, 2007. BB

**The limits of current interventions can be directly traced to a failure of vision, not of nerve.** Conservatives attack the advocacy movement for exaggerating the nature and extent of abuse. In fact, because of [the domestic violence model’s] its singular emphasis on physical violence, the prevailing model minimizes both the extent of women’s entrapment by male partners in personal life and its consequences. Viewing woman abuse through the prism **of** the **incident-specific** and injury-based definition of violence has concealed its major components, dynamics, and effects, including the fact **that** it is neither “domestic” nor primarily about “violence.” Failure to appreciate the multidimensionality of oppression in personal life has been disastrous for abuse victims. Regardless of its chronic nature, courts treat each abuse incident they see as a first offense. Because well over 95% of these incidents are minor, in that the physical assault involved is not injurious, almost no one goes to jail. In custody or divorce cases, because abuse is framed as incident specific or as only involving injurious violence, when women or children present with claims based on the ongoing, multidimensional and cumulative nature of abuse, these are often treated as fabricated. Worse, a protective mother may be blamed when her expressed level of concern or fear is at odds with evidence of assault: in the dependency court, her children may be placed in foster care; in family court, she is alleged to be engaged in alienating her children from the “good enough father.” As calls to the police or visits to the emergency room are repeated over time, the helping response becomes more perfunctory and may actually contribute to making abuse routine, a process called normalization.

Two implications. A] Solves for DV --- framing is crucial to preventing ongoing abuse B] Turns the case because aff perpetuates abuse.

Second, “coercive control” acknowledges the oppressive and cumulative aspect of intimate terrorism that “domestic violence” bluntly ignores. Stark 2:

The easiest way to understand coercive control is to contrast it to the widespread equation of partner abuse with “domestic violence.” Domestic violence laws and most research in the field take an incident-specific focus and weigh the severity of abuse by the level of force used or injury inflicted, what I call a “calculus of harms.” In marked contrast, the coercive control model relies on evidence that most battered women who seek help experience coercion as “ongoing” rather than as merely “repeated” and that the main marker of these assaults is their frequency or even their “routine” nature rather than their severity, a fact that gives abuse a “cumulative” effect found in no other assault crime. Physical harm and psychological trauma remain important in the coercive control model. But its theory of harms replaces the violation of physical integrity with an emphasis on violations of “liberty” that entail the deprivation of rights and resources essential to personhood and citizenship. In this view, the psychological language of victimization and dependence is replaced by the political language of domination, resistance, and subordination. . In the coercive control model, what men do *to* women is less important than what they prevent women from doing for themselves.

This turns the case because “repeated domestic violence” contributes to a culture that is hostile to victims.

This means that the use of deadly force in response to repeated domestic violence is permissible if and only if we refer to the situation as “coercive control” and not “domestic violence”. This alternative principle solves 100% of the AFF offense as we permit the same action as the AFF except refer to the situation they are in as “coercive control”. Given that the actions of both advocacies are indistinguishable, any risk of a net benefit, i.e. a reason why using the word victim is bad, is a reason to negate.

And, if the alternative solves 100% of the AFF, you should vote on a net benefit even if it doesn’t link to a standard because [A] it becomes literally the only unique offense in the debate! You would have nothing else to vote on, and [B] every conception of morality would agree, holding all else equal, that perpetuating the abuse is bad. To get rid of the net benefit, they need to generate offense through a link or impact turn.

Finally, the discourse argument functions as both a link and an impact. It’s a link because it means language counts as a source of pragmatic reasons for belief, so my advocacy is competitive by net benefits. But it’s also a pre-fiat reason to negate: if language shapes reality, then you should reject the resolution’s language because this is the only real-world impact in the round. LD is a meaningful activity because it teaches us how to reason about values in public affairs, so vote neg because the aff contributes to a harmful way of framing domestic violence in public discussion, just as you should vote against debaters who use racial epithets.

# Word PICs Bad Preempts

1. Interpretation: The neg may read one unconditional word PIC w/ at least one net benefit supported by evidence from a scholar in the relevant field of literature.

I meet- I defend the word PIC unconditionally

2. Net benefits:

A] My interpretation demands a rigorous defense of each step of the affirmative’s argumentation that forces in-depth discussion. This is important because when taken to their logical extremes, a painfully in-depth discussion of one issue is more valuable than single sentences covering a thousand topics. Breadth is inevitable over the course of multiple debates- the only chance for in depth discussion is an individual debate round.

B] Only words PICs force debaters to defend their rhetoric. We become more knowledgeable of words used, which is crucial to a good understanding of our language and the knowledge when to use certain words and not others. Also links to optimal decisionmaking skills – teaches us how to persuade people and use the right words in context, which is crucial to optimal decisionmaking skills because we can weigh the relevant advantages and disadvantages of an action and persuade others.

C] Incentivizes Research –My interpretation requires all debaters to critically analyze the implications of their arguments as well as inform themselves through research on common lines of thinking that criticize those assumptions. And, even if debaters don’t read the word PIC often, the threat of debaters reading it encourages research.

# AT Permutation

1. The 1AC rhetorical artifact that doesn’t go away just because he made a permutation; once it’s out there, you can’t take it back. Any permutation you make is just retroactive and doesn’t deny the fact that the original 1AC was flawed. And if he does opt to do the counterplan, that is severance.

[Severance is always bad because then there’s no stable advocacy to argue against, making the 1AR entirely unpredictable and the 1NC functionally useless, which is the epitome of strategy skew and ruins any hope of meaningful clash in round. Clash is important because it increases our advocacy skills and ability to defend things, which is the only portable impact from debate- nothing else stays with us once we leave the room.]

2. Permutation can’t solve- the mention of violence always comes at a tradeoff b/c it blinds us to the oppression involved so the permutation would still link. Stark:

Evan Stark, [Professor of Human Services and Chair, Department of Urban Health Administration at Rutgers University], *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*, Oxford University Press, 2007. BB

Control: Invisible in Plain Sight The victims and perpetrators of coercive control are easily identified. Many of the rights violated in battering are so fundamental to the conduct of everyday life that is hard to conceive of meaningful human existence without them. How is it possible then that it has attracted so little attention? I have already pointed to the prominence of the domestic violence model. Another explanation is the compelling nature of violence. Once injury became the major medium for presenting abuse, its sights and sounds were so dramatic that other experiences seemed muted by comparison. The radical feminists who led the fight against rape and pornography also inadvertently contributed to the invisibility of coercive control. Placing so much political currency on violence against women as the ultimate weapon in men’s arsenal made it a surrogate for male domination rather than merely one of its means. It was a short step to replacing the political discussions of women’s liberation with the talks of “victims” and “perpetrators.” Another explanation for why coercive control has had such little impact is that no one knows what to do about it.

3. You can’t make a permutation if the 1AC was not a plan. The 1AC was not an advocacy, it was a descriptive, truth-testy statement. There’s no action that you’re prescribing for everyone, you’re just labeling it morally permissible. That means the only thing that exists is the 1AC as a speech act, not as a plan for action, and I am winning reasons to reject the speech act.

# DV Bad Extension Ev

The rhetoric of “violence” hides the real issue which is coercion and long-term abuse. Stark:

Evan Stark, [Professor of Human Services and Chair, Department of Urban Health Administration at Rutgers University], *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*, Oxford University Press, 2007. BB

The coercive control model is built on earlier work that has remained marginal to mainstream intervention, a mountain of data that contradicts every major tenet of the domestic violence model; and a growing body of literature documenting the prevalence of tactics to isolate, intimidate and control women in abusive relationships. But its major source is the real-life experiences of perpetrators and victims of abuse As I’ve suggested, the most important anomalous evidence indicates that violence in abusive relationships is ongoing rather than episodic, that its effects are cumulative rather than incident-specific, and that the harms it causes are more readily explained by these factors than by its severity. Among these harms, the dominant approach identifies two for which it fails to adequately account, the entrapmentof victims in relationships where ongoing abuse is virtually inevitable, and the development of a problem profile that distinguishes abused women from every other class of assault victim. The prevailing view is that women stay and develop a range of mental health and behavioral problems because exposure to severe violence induces trauma-related syndromes, such as PTSD or BWS that can disable a woman’s capacity to cope or escape. In fact, however, only a small proportion of abuse victims evidence these syndromes. Most victims of abuse do not develop significant psychological or behavioral problems. Abused women exhibit a range of problems that are unrelated to trauma, the vast majority of assault incidents are too minor to induce trauma, and abuse victims can be entrapped even in the absence of assault. The duration of abusive relationships is made even more problematic when we appreciate that abuse victims are aggressive help seekers and are as likely to be assaulted and even entrapped when they are physically separated as when married or living together. Thus, whatever harms are involved can cross social space as well as extend over time and appear to persist regardless of how women respond. If violence doesn’t account for the entrapment of millions of women in personal life, what does? The answer is coercive control, a strategy that remains officially invisible despite the fact that it has been in plain sight at least since the earliest shelter residents told us in no uncertain terms that “violence wasn’t the worst part.” Cognitive psychologists in the late 1970s and 1980s tried to capture what these women were experiencing by comparing it to “coercive persuasion,” brainwashing, and other tactics used with hostages, prisoners of war, kidnap victims, and by pimps with prostitutes. Largely ignored by researchers, the understanding of abuse as coercive control was developed in popular literature and incorporated at least implicitly into how various practitioners approached the problem. Working on men’s control skills has provided one template for batterers programs since the founding of Emerge in Boston. Prosecutors are increasingly charging batterers with stalking, or harassment as well as domestic violence, crimes that typically involve a course of intimidating and controlling conduct as well of violence. Scotland and Canada are examples of countries that now define violence against women or abuse from a human rights perspective that includes a range of coercive and controlling behaviors in addition to assault. The most widely used graphic representation of abuse is the Power and Control Wheel introduced by the Domestic Violence Intervention Project (DAIP) in Duluth, Minnesota. Although violence is the hub of the original wheel, its spokes depict isolation, economic control, emotional and sexual abuse, and other facets of coercive control. This attention is merited. The several dozen studies that attempt to measure control and psychological abuse suggest that victims have been subjected to multiple control tactics, among which the denial of money, the monitoring of time, and restricted mobility and communication are prominent.

Calling it “domestic violence” means focus is only put on physical aspects- public polls prove. Klein et al:

Ethel Klein, [Former Professor at Harvard University], Jacquelyn Campbell, Esta Soler, Marissa Ghez, “Ending Domestic Violence: Changing Public Perceptions/Halting the Epidemic”, SAGE Publications Inc., 1997. RK

At the outset of our work, **physical, visible injury or threat of injury was where the public drew the line to divide abusive behavior from domestic violence**. In the 1992 EDK survey, **86% of respondents said that when a man hits a woman hard, his actions should no longer be a private matter. Slightly more than half of respondents were ready to insist on societal sanctions at that point, agreeing that he should be arrested** [53%] **or she should leave him** [53%]. Similarly, **the EDK poll showed that there was absolutely no doubt that a man had “crossed the line” if he punched a woman**. Nine out of ten [94%] respondents said that this was a public matter. Most people wanted to see a man arrested for this behavior [80%] and they wanted the victim to leave him [76%]. **To help clarify the public’s definition of domestic violence, EDK survey respondents were presented with a series of vignettes** identified as common situations: a woman screaming at or hitting her child at a mall; neighbors fighting; a fight at a family holiday meal; and a fight between a husband and wife. **They were then asked to assess whether the described circumstances constituted domestic violence** and whether the man should be arrested and the woman encouraged to leave. These vignettes compared similar circumstances involving different degrees of physical violence. We found that **people supported public intervention** [e.g., arrest for him or help for her to leave] **only in cases in which injury was explicit in the description**. The majority of EDK respondents felt that a mother screaming at her child was child abuse. If their daughter’s husband grabbed her and called her a worthless cow or their neighbors were fighting and screaming at the top of their lungs, they believed that these situations constituted domestic violence. However, in all three of these scenarios, respondents were not willing to impose strong sanctions. Only a few said that they would remove the child from the home [6%] and a small percentage would seek arrest for the screaming neighbor [10%] or the abusive husband [15%]; few men and women would tell their neighbor to leave their husband [15%] and less than half [41%] thought their daughter should leave the husband.

# Frontlines

A2 Re-appropriate language

1. Yeah that might be great, but that was not the framing in the 1AC. Once it’s out there you can’t take it back- it was still a rhetorical speech act and I am winning reasons why it’s prohibited
2. In order to account for oppression he would have to change the definition of violence beyond recognition- my argument is that violence causes a focus on the immediate and severe injuries, which doesn’t let us acknowledge the subtle aspect of cumulative oppression. That is how violence is overwhelmingly defined in society- he needs to be reading specific solvency about how that could happen. He only has generic, warrantless cards.

A2 They escape web of abuse [kill the abuser]

1. My arg is not specific to victims who kill- there are other victims who seek help from the CJS and your framing of language precludes that possibility; he’s going to say that’s not his advocacy but impacts don’t have to be topical as long as I’m proving a link
2. After they kill they’ll be tried for murder and unless the juries understand the oppressive nature of what happened, they’ll be found guilty- only my framing gives juries a background understanding of cumulative abuse to prevent that from happening